

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are pending in the application, of which the Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 10-12. By this paper, Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and 10-12 and canceled claims 7 and 8. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, however, amends the claims to further prosecution.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are objected to by the Examiner due to informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and 10-12 to correct for informalities, and are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 7-8 are canceled.

### ***Specification***

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because the disclosure lacked section headings. Applicant has amended the specification to include appropriate section headings.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sukeda et al. (USPN 5,854,997). Claim 8 is canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Fraser In View of Sukeda et al.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser (USPA 2004/0172236) in view of Sukeda et al. (USPN 5,854,997).

Claim 1 is amended to acquire "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side poised from the first side". The Examiner states that "Fraser does not specifically suggest a two-sided display for communication . . . Sukeda, however, recites a language communication device feature to display sides." Fraser does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include a two-sided visual display facility as required in claim 1. Sukeda et al. teaches a display device having "displays 102, 103. . . inverted relative to the other display" and "the two opposing displays arranged side by side for the sake of convenience". (See column 4, lines 1-3 and column 4, lines 60-62, see also Figure 1.) Therefore, Sukeda et al. teaches two display areas arranged side by side and not "having a first side and a second side opposed from the first side" as required by claim 1. Therefore, Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 1, and additionally teaches away from the limitations of claim 1. Therefore since the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 is nonobvious.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore nonobvious over the combination of Fraser and Sukeda et al. for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 6 is amended to require "a display device for displaying information to two people on different sides of the display device, the sides opposing one another". The Examiner states that "Fraser does not specifically suggest use of a two-sided display for communication. . . Sukeda, however, recites a language communication device feature two display sides". Fraser does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include the limitation of "opposed sides" as required in claim 6. Sukeda et al. teaches "displays 102, 103. . . inverted relative to the other display" and "the two opposing displays arranged side by side for the sake of convenience". See column 4, lines 1-3 and lines 60-62, also see Figure 1. Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include the "opposed sides" as required by claim 6, and additionally teaches away from the limitations in claim 6. Therefore, since the combination of references fail to teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include the limitations in claim 6, claim 6 is nonobvious.

Claim 7 is canceled.

**Rejection of Claims 3 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)  
Over Fraser In View of Sukeda et al. and Further In View of Jacobs**

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. and further in view of Jacobs (USPN 4,311,465).

Claim 3 is amended to require "wherein the database further comprises a pack of cards; and wherein the two-sided display facility further comprises each card in the pack of cards carrying a respective message. . . in language L1 . . . on a first side of a card, and in language L2 on a second side of the card." Additionally, claim 3 depends from claim 1 which requires "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side opposed from the first side". The Examiner states that "Fraser in view of Sukeda discloses the language communication configuration . . . as applied to claim 1" and "Jacobs shows dual sided cards for translation". Fraser does not teach a display device with opposed sides. Sukeda et al. teaches "displays 102, 103. . . inverted relative to the other display" and "the two opposing displays arranged side by side for the sake of convenience". (See column 4, lines 1-3 and lines 60-62, also see Figure 1). Sukeda et al. does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include the "opposed sides" as required by claim 3. Therefore, Fraser and Sukeda et al. do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to have a "two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side opposed from the first side, the first side for displaying a selected message . . . in the first language L1 and phonetically in a second language L2, and the second side for displaying a selected message in the second language L2" as required by claim 3. Jacobs teaches a series of cards where "card 32 represents the top most card in column 25 with the front side of the card being shown in Figure 2, and the rear side of the card shown in Figure 8. Card 32' would be that card which is disposed immediately below card 32 with the front side of the card containing English language nouns as depicted in Figure 8". Column 3, lines 42-50. As can be seen in Figure 8 of Jacobs, one side of card 32 contains a word in a first language, while an adjacent card 32' contains the word in a second language. Therefore, Jacobs teaches the use of two cards to translate between a first

language and a second language, and therefore does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 3. Therefore, claim 3 is nonobvious over the combination of Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. and further in view of Jacobs.

Claim 11 depends from claim 3 and is therefore nonobvious over the combination of Fraser, Sukeda et al. and Jacobs for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 3.

**Rejections of Claims 4, 10 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)  
As Being Unpatentable Over Fraser In View of  
Sukeda et al. In View of Jacobs and Further In View of Mestre**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser in view of Sukeda et al. in view of Jacobs and further in view of Mestre (USPN 6,999,915).

Claims 4, 10 and 12 all depend from parent claim 1. Amended claim 1 requires "a two-sided visual display facility having a first side and a second side opposed from the first side, the first side for displaying a message. . . in the first language L1. . . and the second side for displaying a selected message in the second language L2". Fraser and Sukeda et al. do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Jacobs teaches a series of cards where "card 32 represents the top most card in column 25 with the front side of the card being shown in Figure 2, and the rear side of the card shown in Figure 8. Card 32' would be that card which is disposed immediately below card 32 with the front side of the card containing English language nouns as depicted in Figure 8". Column 3, lines 42-50. As can be seen in Figure 8 of Jacobs, one side of card 32 contains a word in a first language, while an adjacent card 32' contains the word in a second language. Therefore, Jacobs teaches the use of two cards to translate between a first language and a second language, and therefore does not teach, suggest, or provide any reason to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Mestre teaches a process and a page 100 shown in Figure 1, and does not teach "a first side and a second side opposed from the first side as required by claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Fraser, Sukeda, Jacobs and Mestre do not teach, suggest, or provide any reason

to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 4, 10 and 12 are nonobvious over the combination of references.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

The Petition fee of \$490.00 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**Roger Payn**

By /Tiffany A. Fidler/  
Tiffany A. Fidler  
Reg. No. 65,366  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 03/08/2010

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351